UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/672,639	09/28/2000	Gary Dan Dotson	00AB154	7884

7590   09/04/2003

Allen-Bradley Company Inc
Attention: John J Horn
Patent Dept/704P Floor 8 T-29
1201 South Second Street
Milwaukee, WI 53204

EXAMINER
WANG, JIN CHENG

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2672	10

DATE MAILED: 09/04/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 11 August 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

a) ☒ The period for reply expires **3** months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☒ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _11 August 2003_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.

2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:

   (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

   (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);

   (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

   (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

   NOTE: _____.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

5. ☒ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: _See Continuation Sheet_.

6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a)☐ will not be entered or b)☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

   The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

   Claim(s) allowed: _____.

   Claim(s) objected to: _____.

   Claim(s) rejected: _____.

   Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.

10. ☐ Other: _____

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

1) Applicant argues in essence that "Tjandrasuwita does not disclose a grayscale generator programmable to generate grayscale formatted data according to a selected display mode as recited by claims 1 and 22. In response, the examiner asserts that Tjandrasuwita teaches a grayscale generator programmable to generate grayscale formatted data according to a selected display mode as recited by claim and similar claims. For example, when STN mode is selected for one of a plurality of disparate display types and formats, Tjandrasuwita applies a grayscale logic 301 through the data path of STN module 207. The examiner recognizes that TFT module 206 and STN module 207 are operated mutually exclusively of each other. However, this does not prevent Tjandrasuwita from meeting the claim limitation because Tjandrasuwita teaches a grayscale generator programmable to generate grayscale formatted data (grayscale logic 301) according to a selected display mode (STN mode) for STN LCD display which is ONE of a plurality of disparate display types and formats (for example STN LCD panels). The examiner absolutely understands that Tjandrasuwita teaches a grayscale logic for an STN module 207 NOT for a TFT module 206. The examiner has never stated that the STN module 207 and the TFT module 206 apply grayscale logic 301. Applicants' representative however states that the examiner has improperly states the STN module 207 and the TFT module 206 apply grayscale logic 301 which is NOT well understood on the part of applicants' representative. The examiner only asserts that the cited reference teaches the claim limitation. Applicant further argues that Tjandrasuwita does not allow flexible application of gray scaling to multiple disparate display types in a single video controller. However, the claim 1 set forth the limitation of "a selected display mode for one of a plurality of disparate display types and formats" which is different from the applicant's argument that Tjandrasuwita does not allow flexible application of gray scaling to multiple disparate display types in a single video controller. In other word, if the a selected mode as recited in the claim 1 is STN mode, Tjandrasuwita meets the rest of the claim limitation as recited. The examiner asserts that applicant's argument presents a different scope of invention from what has been claimed before and/or from what has been argued. Applicants' representative has NOT made a distinction between the claim language and the cited reference in relation to the arguments set forth in the REPLY of August 11, 2003.

2) On page 8, second paragraph, Applicants' representative alleges that the Examiner incorrectly interprets the terms display mode and display type. In response, even though the Examiner has stated that Tjandrasuwita provides STN mode and TFT mode, Tjandrasuwita clearly teaches STN LCD, TFT LCD panels, TV monitors, CRT panels. The claim limtation is CLEARLY met when the selected display mode is STN for ONE of a plurality of disparate display types and formats (for STN LCD panels).

3) While addressing the aruguments presented on page 8, third paragraph, the examiner must point out that the rejection set forth in the previous Office Action has NOT rely upon employing grayscale logic 301 with respect to both TFT and STN modes.

4) On page 9, second paragraph, Applicant argues that the raster engine utilizes a single output for the numerous display modes in relation to the claimed limitation of a parallel output according to a selected display mode. The examiner wishes to point out that applicant claims ONE THING while argues for ANOTHER THING because "A SINGLE OUTPUT" is clearly distinguished from "A PARALLEL OUTPUT". Tjadrawisuta clearly teaches in FIGURE 1 a parallel output according to a selected display mode.

5) Applicant argues in essence with respect to claim 15 that Tjandrasuwita fails to teach or suggest a grayscale lookup table control register. However, Tjandrasuwita teaches a grayscale lookup table and the dithering engine 204 and the mapping scheme of column 7 may be designed to be programmable. Therefore, a grayscale lookup table control register achieves the programmable objective for the mapping scheme of column 7. From the programmable mapping scheme and the grayscale lookup table, it is concluded that the claimed element of a grayscale lookup table control register is inherently in the cited reference.

MICHAEL RAZAVI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600